

9th July 1952]

MRS. M. N. CLUBWALA :—“ Is the Hon. Minister aware that immoral traffic is very much on the increase due to many lapses in the existing Act? ”

THE HON. SRI K. P. KUTTIKRISHNAN NAIR :—“ That is why, Sir, an amendment is sought for.”

[Note.—An asterisk (*) at the commencement of a speech indicates revision by the Member.]

II.—ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE HON. CHAIRMAN.

ELECTION OF A MEMBER TO THE STATE LIBRARY COMMITTEE.

MR. CHAIRMAN :—“ I have to announce to the House that the following persons were nominated for election of one member by the Legislative Council to the State Library Committee :—

(1) Sri Alexander Gnanamuttu, M.L.C.

(2) Sri E. H. Parameswaran, M.L.C.

“ As the number of candidates nominated exceeded one, an election was held to-day between 2 p.m. and 3-30 p.m. After the election was over, counting of votes took place. The result of the counting was as follows :—

(1) Sri E. H. Parameswaran, 34.

(2) Sri Alexander Gnanamuttu, 9.

Invalid papers, nil.

“ I hereby declare Sri E. H. Parameswaran duly elected to the State Library Committee.”

III.—GOVERNMENT BUSINESS.

GENERAL DISCUSSION ON THE BUDGET FOR THE YEAR 1952-53—cont.

SRI T. PRAKASAM (continued from the previous day, 8th July 1952) :—“ Mr. Chairman, Sir, yesterday I was mentioning that it would not be possible to secure any economic recovery in the country unless and until the debt that stands against the Government is discharged. There is no chance of that debt being discharged under the present system of Government with its present economic policy. As I mentioned yesterday, the first Paper Currency Act was passed in 1861. Long before that, the British people who had taken possession of this country started an exchange ratio business in or about 1801. As that went on, in 1861, the British Government passed the Paper Currency Act. Under that Act, Rs. 4 crores worth of Government securities alone were exempted and the rest should be backed by metallic securities—gold and silver. In that way Rs. 44 crores was put in circulation through currency notes and that state of affairs had continued for 53 years when the first World War broke out in 1914. One could imagine how during the whole of that period of 53 years, there was no economic trouble in the country on account of paper currency or exchange ratio or any of those things to the extent to which they

4-15
p.m.

[Sri T. Prakasam]

[9th July 1952]

started thereafter. The first World War broke out in 1914. It lasted five years till 1919. During those five years, Rs. 44 crores worth of currency debt rose to Rs. 120 crores, although the Paper Currency Act provided that there should be metallic security for the whole amount. During the war, without any sanction, they went on printing currency notes to the tune of Rs. 120 crores without providing any metallic security for that amount. At the end of the war in 1919, the Paper Currency Act was amended in such a way as to provide metallic security only for 50 per cent and not for the whole amount. This was done because they were not able to provide metallic backing like gold and silver. Sir, that state of affairs continued till the second World War broke out. It lasted six years and at the end of the sixth year, the war debt rose to Rs. 1,500 crores, out of which Rs. 600 crores was spent by the British people for war purposes. For Rs. 900 crores, they went on printing currency notes without any security and without any sanction. The whole of that amount has been thrown on this country as debt due from the people of this country while really they have to get it from the British people who committed forgery of the currency notes to that extent without any metallic security. It is the people that have to suffer on account of currency notes which were printed and issued by the British people. Therefore, it is a liability which is outstanding against the people of this country even to-day. Sir, by the time we attained Independence, this paper currency debt rose up to over Rs. 1,200 crores. I ask you, Sir, and the hon. Members of this House to imagine how Rs. 44 crores which endured for 53 years rose to Rs. 1,200 crores. There is no metallic security for this amount as it had been done away with in 1931. When the British people saw the trend of events, they found that it was impossible to maintain the gold standard and they decided to go off the gold standard and then they went on printing notes as they liked and according to their convenience and by the time the British left this country, the debt came to Rs. 1,200 crores. The British people did not leave this country out of love towards us. When the debt came to Rs. 1,200 crores, they found that they could not cope with it and it would be impossible for them to continue the administration in this country. Therefore they said they would go away to their country and asked us to take charge and carry on the administration. At the same time they had taken particular care to see that certain pieces of legislation were passed in the House of Commons to the effect that they would not be liable for any liability here. They went away and what is the result so far as this country is concerned?

“ Sir, the Budget has been presented here, and over Rs. 61 crores is shown as income, and expenditure is also shown. Year after year, we have been carrying on the administration without making any attempt to show to what extent this country is in debt. No such attempt will be made by the present Government as it is constituted to-day. I do not mean this Government but the Government, as it is constituted in Delhi. They have not said how they are going to reduce the debt or discharge the debt. In the circumstances, can

9th July 1952]

[Sri T. Prakasam]

anybody say that they will be able to get full control over the economic condition of this country? Why is this country not self-sufficient in food and clothing when they are available in plenty in this country? As I pointed out to you, the paper currency debt is responsible for this situation. When the British left this country, they asked our people to pay for the currency notes that they issued when they were here. I ask, wherefrom will this money be given? Wherefrom money will be given by the Madras Government? Wherefrom will Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru be able to meet this currency note debt? I may tell you, Sir, after the first World War, Germany became bankrupt and England became very nearly bankrupt. Germany put up a notice board at the premises of their State Bank, asking the people not to present currency notes as there was no money in the Treasury and that they had to pay back to Americans the old debt that they incurred. Whereas in England each pound in the foreign market was reduced to 8 shillings from 20 shillings. That was the condition in which those countries were placed during that crisis.

“ Sir, after the Second World War, when a Budget is presented one would naturally expect the Government to tell the people how much they have borrowed and when they are going to discharge their debts. No such attempt has been made either here or elsewhere in this country. Therefore, this Budget, as it is presented to-day, is not the Budget which the people wanted and this is not the Government which the people wanted to present this Budget. Sir, fifteen years ago, I happened to be the Revenue Minister and Mr. Rajagopalachari the Chief Minister. When I presented the Budget then, I had stated that I was not responsible for what was written in the Budget speech and that somebody prepared it. Sir, this is not the Budget that our people want from this Government. The Budget that the people expect now is a village-war Budget giving details of the income and expenditure of each district. I want that such a type of Budget should be presented. Fifteen years ago I made that speech. I have not changed my mind and you all know, my hon. Friend Mr. Rajagopalachari has changed. He has presented this Budget on the British lines and on the same old system. How can the people expect food and clothing if my hon. Friend is to make a defence of every item made here, on the old lines of the British rulers? The Britishers prepared a form in which the Budget is to be presented and that form is being continued. I ask, is it a mere jugglery of figures? Sir, it is better to know in what stage the country is, and the debt is. Until the debt is discharged, it is difficult for any Finance Minister or even a Prime Minister to make both ends meet in the real sense of the term. Look, Sir, during the last few years, how were the food-grains purchased from other countries? I stated already that in 1947 one hundred crores of rupees of the poor people were paid for purchasing foodgrains from outside. In the next year, 150 crores were paid for purchasing foodgrains, and in the third year 250 crores of rupees were paid; and in that way, in the space of five years, one thousand crores of rupees of the poor people were paid to purchase foodgrains from outside. That being so, will any reasonable man

[Sri T. Prakasam]

[9th July 1952]

expect or believe that this Government will be able to discharge this debt? No. I will state here, what an Ambassador of the United States, now at Delhi, said. In his speech, he stated, referring to the purchase of foodgrains (his name is Mr. Chester Bowles) 'if only India eliminates the purchase of foodgrains, she could save six hundred to eight hundred million dollars every year and the industrial development can be carried on in this country itself.' This is what he said a few weeks ago. So, Sir, how can this Government justify its position with regard to the purchase of foodgrains? One thousand crores having been paid already and over one thousand crores due on account of currency note inflation! That had been the legacy left by Great Britain, which they are bound to discharge. Sir, I put this question in Parliament, when I happened to be there. The Finance Member and others were coming and going to England with a view to negotiate the business there; but not one person could raise the real question there. Therefore, Sir, it is not possible for any one to say that this is a Budget which should be swallowed by the people. The people wanted a different Budget altogether. Sir, Mr. Rajagopalachari was the first disciple of Mahatma Gandhi. Mahatma Gandhi gave a constructive programme to the country. For 25 long years, he built and ran a parallel Government, as it were, as opposed to the British Government. Therein he established as many departments as there were in the administration of the British Government. He started from the very beginning; he taught them how they should work, how they should carry on, how they should produce their own food and so on. All these things, for 25 long years he taught us. Then what happened? Soon after the British people went away, non-violence turned into violence, rivers of blood flowed in North India on account of conflict. Then, Mahatma Gandhi was invited to go to the affected areas to pacify them. This was organized by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and others there. But he declined to go there. Why did he decline? He was asked why he declined to go, when he was the Father of the Nation and when he was responsible for securing the freedom of the country; he said, 'Well, Prakasam, what did they expect me to go and see there? I carried on the administration of the Congress for 25 years peacefully, we carried on the fight against the British people for 25 long years and the British people voluntarily left this country; and now after they have gone, I am floating on the crest of a river of blood; what am I to do there?' That was what Mahatma Gandhi said. I for one had my own part in the struggle to drive away the British people from this land and establish a Government of our own people for the benefit of our own people. I never wavered in my mind about my duty to the country. I was then practising in the High Court when this Gentleman (the Chief Minister) came in. I took some little time to wind up my work there; for it was not easy to break of the connexion there. I joined this Gentleman (the Chief Minister); he was very good and kind; he was the first disciple of Mahatma Gandhi; and so he introduced me to Mahatma Gandhi. In that context, one morning, he was staying in Mylapore then, Mahatma Gandhi put a very inconvenient question to a few of us

9th July 1952]

[Sri T. Prakasam]

who had been there, to Mr. Rajagopalachari and some others who were under the influence of Mr. Rajagopalachari. He said, 'Well, Sir, I have been appealing to the people of this country with regard to wearing of khaddar, spinning and weaving. My appeal has not reached the heart of the people. I would like to say now that we are wearing unnecessary cloth on our body, we shall shake off all these cloths, we will go only in a loin cloth, so that all that cloth may be available to the poor people.' He wanted a reply for that. He waited for five minutes. I waited to see whether my great friend or anybody else present there would reply. But no reply came from anybody. Then myself, being bolder than the rest, told Mahatma Gandhi, 'If you wear loin cloth you will be loved by the people. But if you ask us to wear loin cloth and if we go about in loin cloth, we will be laughed at by the people, because people do not believe that we have got the merit of yours.' He did not take the decision then; he went further South, and there, he announced his decision to go about in loin cloth, but he did not expect his followers to go about in loin cloth. That was the beginning of Mahatma Gandhi's work. He has done that for the last twenty-five years. He trained the people in constructive work. The only man who was cleverer than all others was Mr. Rajagopalachari. He was able to manage both Mahatma Gandhi and the people of the country. Then what happened? Mahatma Gandhi's programme was in full swing. Mahatma Gandhi was imprisoned. In the second year of his imprisonment, that programme was relaxed by Mr. Rajagopalachari by giving permission to Pandit Motilal Nehru and Mr. C. R. Das to suspend Gandhian movement for three months. It was done in order to enable them to go to the country to convert the country to their view. Their view was that Gandhian programme has failed. Mind you, they went to jail only for six months. After their return, they wanted to change the Gandhian programme to secure the vote of the people. My friend obliged them. I was put on the Working Committee as a precaution on his recommendation. For I was an unruly man at all times to all people. When this Gentleman (the Chief Minister) yielded to these two people in regard to the change in the Gandhian programme in a most heartless manner, this was only the thin end of the wedge; it is not suspension for three months; it is suspension for ever; for Gandhian movement was sure to be killed."

MR. CHAIRMAN :—"Your time is up."

SRI T. PRAKASAM :—"If the time is up, you will have to extend the time. (Laughter.) This is a longer story than Ramayana. (Laughter.) The story is longer than Mahabharatha and the performances of my great friend are longer performances than that of the other two great men. Now that was the first thing.

"The second attempt of Sri Rajagopalachari was to get a civil disobedience committee appointed, in which he was a member. There were others also in that committee. For what purpose was that committee appointed? With a view to see that the programme

[Sri T. Prakasam]

[9th July 1952]

of Mahatma was not continued. They all came to Guntur. I was the President of the Provincial Congress Committee. I had no garlands to present to the Members who came there. They came a little bit late; I presented them a garland of 100 volunteers ready to be sent to jail! Because I was feeling that the committee was going to destroy the spirit and courage with which men, women and children were working the Gandhian programme, and also the national Satyagraha movement. This is what happened at the second stage. Now to the third stage.

“ In the fourth or fifth year, there was the Belgaum Congress. My friend has stated that he wanted a vote of confidence in the Ministry; this, he said in the other House. What did Mahatma Gandhi do when the struggle arose between himself on one part and Mr. C. R. Das and Mr. Motilal Nehru on the other. There was the Congress held at Belgaum. For that Pandit Motilal Nehru and Mr. C. R. Das came bringing with them three carriage load of delegates to support their side. We all attended that session of the Congress. In spite of all their efforts they were defeated; they did not succeed. Gandhi himself succeeded. Now about the result, you should know what Mahatma Gandhi said. He said, ‘ Though I have succeeded, this is not a success for me. This is not the kind of working I want. I have succeeded by a narrow majority and they are defeated by a narrow majority, I will not like it as a success for me. I will ask them to take charge of this Congress and carry on the administration.’ But, what has this Gentleman done who wanted a vote of confidence? How did he get the vote and how did the people vote? I will grant it that they all feared him especially when Rajagopalachari came as an Avatar of God himself and claimed to have a sway over this country with a view to save the country from chaos and asked for a vote of confidence to enable him to carry on the administration. Now, we will see, Sir, whether they will arrive on top of the chaos and whether they will be ruling over the people of this country. As I have already pointed out, Sir, false currency notes that were issued to the extent of Rs. 1,200 crores are over the heads of the people. The Government do not care a tuppence for this loan. They do not know how the people are oppressed to-day. Control has been removed. By whom, I ask? Control has been removed by Providence. I mean Providence in the sense that just as all other commodity prices were falling down from the high level at which they were maintained by artificial methods, the prices of these foodgrains were also falling and my Friend, Sri C. Rajagopalachari, decontrolled the foodgrains and gave his blessings to it because there could be no trouble on account of decontrol as prices were falling. Decontrol is a thing that could not be accomplished by any single person.

“ Mahatma Gandhi gave a programme under which all the troubles arising out of inflation and rising prices and deflation could be levelled down and controlled. After managing the whole thing for nearly 25 to 30 years Mahatma Gandhi handed over the administration to us after the British had gone away. What did we do? We went there, Sir, to Delhi to sit in the Constitution House for

9th July 1952]

[Sri T. Prakasam]

framing a Constitution for the benefit of the people. Sir, all the persons who were in charge there including Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and the great Sri C. Rajagopalachari put their faith in the British system of administration which they introduced here and copied verbatim as it were the whole of their system in our New Constitution. The New Constitution is only a copy of the 1935 Government of India Act that was prepared by the British people sitting in England without coming here and when we were agitating against the British people. This Act has been bodily embodied in our Constitution by our great leaders. I was also a fool for some time because I did not protest against it at the proper time. Dr. Ambedkar was in charge of the Drafting Committee and after some progress in framing the Constitution had been made I got up and said 'For whose benefit are you framing this Constitution, Dr. Ambedkar? Who got the freedom of this country? Was it not Mahatma Gandhi that got the freedom of this land? Was it not the people of India who made the biggest of sacrifices in the world to secure this freedom? Did not Mahatma Gandhi say that the panchayat system must be introduced in the country?' Under the panchayat system, I believe, the people will get the benefit of real swaraj and they will have the opportunity to get the money into their own hands to carry on the administration. That is how this Constitution must be framed, and that is what Mahatma Gandhi also said. When I pointed out all these things there was a discussion over it and most of the Members said that what Mahatma Gandhi said must be carried out now. By way of a compromise, Sir, as Sir B. N. Rau and others said that we cannot go back after two years, for it will take another five years for the Constitution to take shape, I agreed to the clause in Article 40 of the Constitution of India that the panchayat system must be introduced in every district after the Constitution comes into force. There has been an administration going on here, Sir, but has the panchayat system been introduced? No, Sir, there is no panchayat system. Allow me to tell you, Sir, I happened to be elected as the leader of the Congress Party in 1946 and I was asked to take up the reins of administration. I tried my best to introduce the constructive programme of Mahatma Gandhi in the working of the provincial Constitution itself. I prepared draft proposals how the whole Constitution should be worked out by us according to the dreams of Mahatma Gandhi. I sent an I.C.S. Officer specially with my proposals to Mahatma Gandhi. He made some modifications and sent it back and I started my Government on that basis and was carrying on the Government. The only mistake I made at that time was that I did not present these proposals to Sri C. Rajagopalachari before I sent them to Mahatma Gandhi. I failed to do it. Anyway, Sri C. Rajagopalachari has not been concerned with the programme of Mahatma Gandhi. Can he say now, I will ask him, whether any of the items dear to Mahatma Gandhi have been carried out or been proposed to be carried out by him? The 1935 Act was introduced into the Constitution and it is only in pursuance of that Constitution that we are assembled here to-day."

[9th July 1952]

MR. CHAIRMAN :—" The hon. Member's time is up. I cannot give him more than another five minutes."

SRI T. PRAKASAM :—" Sir, you must give me some more time. I am telling you, Sir, in particular because I am the only man competent to speak on these matters. I am here, Sir, with a view to educate all those outside this House and also my Friends here wherever such education is required.

" Now, Sir, that Government that was built up by me with the approval of Mahatma Gandhi was broken up before the year was out. It was broken up. I put the question, Sir, ' At whose instance, for what reason and for what purpose? ' I say, Sir, this Rajagopalachari was primarily responsible for the breaking up of that Government. I say so, because his friend sitting as Commerce Member or some other Member in the Government of India, made proposals to me when I was Premier here that I should take into my Cabinet four or five members of his group. He is a very good host and a very good friend in all other respects. Everything was done in the presence of Sardar Vallabhai Patel. I said ' I will only make a fool of myself if I took four or five members from this group and expanded my Cabinet '. But I made an offer to Sri A. Vaidyanatha Ayyar of Madurai who was the leader of Rajaji's party or group in that wretched House all these five years. I made the offer to him. He came at midnight to my house and said ' Prakasam, please do not put me in. We have not decided to accept office yet.' So, I did not do it. By the time a few months were over and the progress that was made was noticed by my esteemed Friend, he wanted his own men to be introduced in the Cabinet but he met only with refusal. Well, Sir, he got annoyed and there was a vote of no-confidence here in this City; a vote of no-confidence by Rajagopalachari's disciples. One disciple of Sri Rajagopalachari who headed the no-confidence vote came and told me ' Well, Sir, we have no confidence in you and we are going to move this resolution against you.' It was the same disciple who, while speaking on the floor of this House, asked that power should be given to Sri C. Rajagopalachari for at least five years more to carry on his administration. Now, this is the way in which my Government was broken up. Afterwards another friend came in and what all happened my Friend, Sri C. Rajagopalachari, did not know. He laughs quietly as if nothing has happened in this world. Yes, I am very glad it is his habit. Files were stolen."

5 p.m. THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" My friend is in utter delusion. It is all I can say."

SRI T. PRAKASAM :—" A short answer, ' utter delusion '. Yes."

MR. CHAIRMAN :—" I have given the hon. Member more than one hour and I will not be able to give more time."

SRI T. PRAKASAM :—" Mr. Chairman, Sir, you are a new man. Allow me to tell you, you must be able to distinguish which is which"

9th July 1952]

MR. CHAIRMAN :—" I have done that."

SRI T. PRAKASAM :—" You have not done that." (Cries of ' Order, order ' from Congress Benches.)

SRI B. V. SUBRAHMANYAM :—" May I intervene and make this suggestoin, Sir. You were pleased to grant me time this evening to speak. If the hon. Member Mr. Prakasam is willing to avail himself of it and if you permit him to do it, I have no objection to give a portion of my time."

SRI T. PRAKASAM :—" Nobody need come to my rescue. I want to say one or two words to Mr. C. Rajagopalachari, about the vote of confidence secured by him in the Legislative Assembly by a 50-vote majority. Fifty Members supported him over and above the 151 Members of the Congress Party. These fifty Members are persons who succeeded against the Congress candidates at the General Elections. By what stretch of imagination can Mr. C. Rajagopalachari say that they have given their vote of confidence to him? I can read the names of the 151 Members of the Congress Party one by one and show that they are not Congressmen. Is the Hon. Mr. Manickavelu Naicker a Congressman? How did he become the Revenue Minister? For what purpose did Mr. Rajagopalachari appoint him as Revenue Minister? What about the K.L.P. Friends who were very anxious to support the Hon. Mr. C. Rajagopalachari? You are very impatient, Sir, and I cannot take you into the history of the K.L.P. Party. I am trying to be brief. K.L.P. Party people are not Congressmen. Is it not a fact that two Members of the K.L.P. Party were not present in the House at the time of the Vote-of-Confidence Motion and had proceeded to Nidubrolu to meet their leader Prof. N. G. Ranga and bring him to Madras in order to put the other Members of the K.L.P. Party in their proper place with regard to their duty? I want to say this thing finally. Mahatma Gandhi has taught us all that it makes no difference whether the rulers are English or Indians and they should be pulled down if the people do not like them. Unfortunately Mahatma Gandhi is not now alive . . ."

MR. CHAIRMAN :—" I must now ask you to finish your speech."

SRI S. B. ADITYAN :—" The hon. Member is finishing."

MR. CHAIRMAN :—" Let Mr. Prakasam say."

SRI T. PRAKASAM :—" Don't you think, Sir, I am anxious to finish? Don't you think, Sir, I am anxious to maintain order? I am telling Mr. C. Rajagopalachari that he should not be carried away by the vote of confidence which he has secured, with the help of independents. It is the people who will have to decide. Mahatma Gandhi carried on a struggle against the English with the help of the people patiently for 25 years and sent them out, and people are ready to adopt his methods. People are ready to

[Sri T. Prakasam]

[9th July 1952]

carry on a big fight against this Government which is ruling them. I shall myself lead an army of Satyagrahis when the time comes.

“With regard to this matter I feel very much that such things should have taken place, after five years of experience and after the electors have dismissed most of the Ministers at the polls. Mr. C. Rajagopalachari is the protector of the Congress Ministers when charges were pending against them. Therefore I am telling him that this matter will not stop with the vote of confidence.”

*DR. A. LAKSHMANASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—“Mr. Chairman, Sir, it used to be said at one time that the Budget discussions allowed freedom for Members to wander from China to Peru. But in view of the quick transport available, the analogy will no longer hold good. One can probably say that they may wander from the earth to the moon travelling around all the satellites of those bodies as well. Sir, having listened to the discussions of this House, having sat for five long years in the House, I do feel that there are certain very important changes that one has got to note. For one thing, I feel a little embarrassed, with the huge new spacious hall into which we have been suddenly thrown from the small narrow Chamber where Members and visitors could almost talk with each other. Now I find the physical proportions of this House are very much bigger than what I had anticipated. But it is not only in regard to the physical atmosphere that I feel the change. I think a greater change has been felt by some of us in the intellectual atmosphere that has been surrounding this House for some time. For what reason that intellectual atmosphere has changed, whether it is for good or for worse, I shall not anticipate an answer at present.

“Mr. Chairman, before I proceed to the Budget, may I offer one remark about a matter that has elicited great praise on the one side and some amount of criticism on the other. The policy of decontrol that the Ministry has so boldly come forward with has been given the greatest amount of praise and on the other hand there are not wanting people, particularly people outside this State, who have not hesitated to say that this policy was determined on account of political expediency, on account of various other factors unconnected with the policy in the matter of food. With your permission, Sir, may I refer to the speech that I delivered at the general discussion on the Budget in 1951-52, on the 5th March 1951 and I may be pardoned, Sir, for quoting from the official report of the speech.

“I said: ‘One of the great difficulties that people experience at present is in regard to those articles over which the Government exercise control. Not only do the controls mean a great deal of expenditure and the establishment that is necessary to work them, but the controls themselves have come to such a pass that unfortunately the people have begun to feel that these controls are rather engines of oppression than of benefit. What does this control lead to? It leads to corruption, dearness allowance,

9th July 1952] [Dr. A. Lakshmanaswami Mudaliyar]

probably both, and black-marketing with increased prices, and the spiral goes on till inflation occurs in the country and in fact, our chief trouble at present is that this inflationary trend may perhaps ruin the economy of the country completely. Wherever controls have been imposed, black-marketing and corruption have thriven

“ ‘ During the term of the first Ministry, cloth control was imposed and there were debates in this House when it was complained that even four to five yards of cloth were not available for purchase. But within two or three weeks after the removal of cloth control, the people came hawking to your very doors and begging you to purchase the cloth that was available in plenty. There was no scarcity of cloth whatsoever. Everybody got what he or she wanted.

“ ‘ Take the control over firewood. There also we see the same situation. There was a great deal of blackmarketing in firewood also. The Government passed an order that firewood should not be obtained by felling trees in compounds. It almost appeared suddenly in this land where firewood had always been plentiful that there was no firewood at all. The control was removed and today nobody complains of firewood shortage.

“ ‘ Take again the control over Bengalgram and pulses. As long as the control was there, the commodity was exceedingly difficult to obtain. Take petrol and kerosene. You will remember how queues were kept standing before the depots where kerosene was being given under the permit system. What happened after the controls were removed? The companies that are responsible for the sale of petrol are to my knowledge asking these bunks to give more and more of petrol and sales in their accounts show that there is more and more of petrol in these bunks. Let us come to the control we had over motor vehicles. Questions were asked and a list of names of those to whom permits were given for purchase of motor vehicles was furnished. A great deal of shady transaction was said to have taken place and I know motor cars could not be purchased unless an amount was paid in the shape of indirect purchase tax, shall I say. Since the moment control was removed, motor cars have been available and there is no difficulty now. Take a commodity which is so essential for house-building as cement. There was a good deal of trouble about it. But to-day, cement companies are spending a lot of money to the benefit of the newspapers in advertising that cement is available for sale.

“ ‘ My point, Sir, is that it is an unfortunate experiment, which a Government will never be in a position to carry out successfully, to impose controls. Trade must flourish, barriers must be removed, free exchange of commodities must be allowed, and you will find that there is a much healthier spirit in the nation; corruption will be rooted out; blackmarket will become white market and the people will thank you for it.’

“ ‘ Sir, having quoted it, I feel I can sincerely congratulate this Government and thank them for the removal of controls. I see

[Dr. A. Lakshmanaswami Mudaliyar] [9th July 1952]

that many other States are following this example and I believe, in giving credit where it is due, we shall not be departing from any just laws. To talk therefore of this policy being a policy directed by ulterior motives, is, in my opinion, to be guilty of hitting below the belt.

“ Now, Sir, I come to the Budget proper. In trying to understand and to give my views on the Budget, I cannot afford to forget some of the essential parts behind the preparation of this Budget. I do not think it will be fair to say that the Treasury Bench is responsible for this Budget. They had inherited a Budget that had already been presented to the Council and the Legislative Assembly although it was called a four-month Budget and that Budget had to be taken note of and could not possibly be suddenly rooted out or changed. I know something of the methods of the preparation of a budget. With that fact is added the fact that there was only one Member of the old Cabinet in the present Cabinet and that there are only two Members, the Hon. Chief Minister and the Hon. the Health Minister who knew anything of the preparation of the budget—and I mean no disrespect to their colleagues on the Treasury Bench, but I know, however, that there were hardly half a dozen Members accustomed to Budget proceedings, debates and answering questions on the Budget on the Treasury Bench, when this Government came to take power; I feel Sir that I have to withhold some of the more important and perhaps severe criticisms that I would have otherwise laid at the door of this Budget, had it been prepared with due deliberation and the time factor that ought to be taken into consideration. Having said that, not as an apology, but as a matter of fact, I should take note of it myself in addressing myself to the details of the Budget, let me now come to the fundamental factors connected with the Budget. Sir, the total revenue of this Province during 1945-46, the year preceding the assumption of office by the popular Government was Rs. 47.98 crores and if out of that amount, we take out the Excise revenue of Rs. 16.09 crores, the revenue of this State was Rs. 31.89 crores. The revenue anticipated in the present Budget year, for 1952-53 by the Hon. the Finance Minister is Rs. 61.75 crores of which a sum of Rs. 33 lakhs is expected as revenue from Excise. So the revenue expected in 1952-53 excluding the amount under Excise is Rs. 61.42 crores. If to this amount is added the amounts to be realised by way of the additional taxes proposed from the measures that have been suggested by the Treasury Benches, the whole amount will come to about Rs. 65 crores; in other words, taxation measures within the last six years have yielded an increase of revenue from Rs. 31.89 crores to Rs. 65 crores; in fact the amount of taxes within these six years has more than doubled.

“ In connexion with these taxation proposals, I have always felt that we must take note of two other factors. The time of the Budget, namely, the end of February, was a time when some people, not all people, had to be looking forward with anxiety on their faces not because they do not want to pay any taxes that are

9th July 1952] [Dr. A. Lakshmanaswami Mudaliyar]

levied justly on them, but because they do not know wherefrom the bolt from the blue will come. It must be conceded that those of us, especially living in big cities, have to look forward to measures of taxation of the Central Government, the taxation measures of the State Government and also the taxation measures of the Corporation of Madras with which you have been so long and so honourably connected. This three-pronged attack on one and the same person has to be borne in mind and this fact was brought to my notice much more when my Friend Sri Gurunandan Rao the other day asked : ' Why is the Sales Tax so low in the case of motor cars? It is only nine pies in the rupee now; can we not make it 24 pies in the rupee? ' I believe if my memory serves me aright, that is the figure that he suggested. There is nothing wrong and nothing preventing the Treasury Benches from enhancing twenty-four pies to even 240 pies for a rupee. But does he realise what a motor-car owner has to pay? He has to pay from 60 to 65 per cent of the cost of the car to the Central Government in the shape of customs duties before it is received by him. But that is a taxation of the Central Government and my esteemed Friend Mr. Deshmukh will not take a pie out of that because the State Government is going to increase the Sales Tax upon it. Let me also state another fact and my Friends sitting here may also take note of it. We all want that the common man must be benefited; we have liquidated kings, we have liquidated the Maharajas, we have liquidated the Rajahs and the last of that category, we have also liquidated the zamindars and also the inamdars and we have come to the next stage of liquidating other classes. At an interview this morning, I asked a student what his father was and he said that his father was a landlord and I suggested to him : ' For God's sake, do not use that expression; the landlords are going to be liquidated, whether they are landlords or any other lords '. Leaving apart any attempt at joke, let us take the income-tax and see how it is collected. The Hon. the Finance Minister of the Centre in the course of a speech said that the number of income-tax payees in the Union is not more than 0.25 per cent of the total population, it is a quarter per cent as against 40 per cent of the population in the United Kingdom and 45 per cent in the United States of America. I wish this fact should go down our throats and heads so that we may really know what is the total number of persons who can be tapped again and again for purposes of State revenue, the Central Revenue and even the revenues of the local boards. If it is realized that all these persons earning Rs. 3,600 or over in a year are subject to income-tax—I do not say that those who are liable to pay income-tax escape it or escape a part of it but my point is no single person can really escape the income-tax in these days—what is the rate of income-tax? The Department does not take into consideration as in the United Kingdom or the United States of America the fact whether the assessee is married or unmarried and how many children he has and so on. In England, for every child, the assessee gets an exemption and when I was there for a year on deputation, I paid no income-tax whatever because some exemption was given because I did not live there for full six months and

[Dr. A. Lakshmanaswami Mudaliyar] [9th July 1952]

because my children claimed some exemption on account of educational concessions. Without any exemption but applying the rule of the thumb in a mechanical manner, the Income-tax Department of the Government of India and the Hon. Finance Minister of the Government of India have taxed everybody possible in a population of 350 millions and with all that he is able to get under his thumb only 25 per cent of the population and it is from that 25 per cent that some of our Friends sitting behind me and with me probably, are thinking of taking money by means of such measures of taxation as are necessary for the benefit of the common man. I wish them all joy but let them remember that there is such a thing as killing the goose that lays the golden eggs and perhaps when they have killed the goose, they will miss the golden eggs.

“ But let me take another tax. The bulk of the revenues of this State comes from what is known as the Sales Tax. The Hon. the Premier was responsible for that tax but I will take no sort of umbrage at the introduction of the sales tax except to say even now it would be far more to the point if you make it not a sales tax but a purchase tax. In England, it is called the purchase tax because it is not the salesman that pays it but the buyer, the person who has been foolish enough to make the purchase. I do not mind what incidence of taxation there is in the purchase tax but I would request the Government to seriously consider some aspects of this taxation. It was a pleasant surprise to me when I was in England to find that if I bought some goods there and had them handed over to me at the plane, I escaped the purchase tax. What is the principle behind it? Does not the Finance Minister know that the tax will dwindle and it will become stereotyped and small in course of time unless you take note of the fact that trade must flourish and the people in the State must not be handicapped as compared with the people outside. In fact for the goods which are to be sent out and which really form the wealth of the nation, you should revise the policy behind the purchase tax. In England exports are in every manner encouraged and it is because of this encouragement given to the export trade that what little they have been able to recover after the war, has been possible. There is what is known as the dollar earning factor in exports. We are struggling, we go to several conferences and committees and we discuss many matters. But I wish to know whether we take at least some of the few good points that we may get; I do not want the bad points to be taken. I would request the Hon. the Premier and the Hon. the Finance Minister to take note of this.

“ I am sorry my Friend Sri O. P. Ramaswami Reddiyar is not here. He referred to the rural and urban incidence of taxation but I am not able to know even after a very careful reading of the Budget for a few days, exactly what the incidence of taxation is between the rural and the urban areas. It is because we have not got a scientific approach to taxation proposals and it is because of that I made the special appeal on the last occasion when the Budget was discussed in 1951 that a Committee should be appointed to go into the whole system of taxation both in the State

9th July 1952] [Dr. A. Lakshmanaswami Mudaliyar]

and the Centre. I was pleased to see from this morning's papers that the Centre contemplates the appointment of a Committee of this nature and I would request the Hon. the Premier to take note of that and to appoint a State Taxation Enquiry Committee as well which will take note of State taxation as well as taxes imposed by corporations and municipalities. My object is not to defraud the Government of such revenue as they may be able to get by these taxation proposals but I submit that the law of dwindling returns will operate on you unless you take note of economic factors and unless you are able in a reasoned and scientific manner to help make the people richer and richer every day.

"I would like to tell my Hon. Friend the Hon. the Finance Minister that his role as a tax-gatherer is an antediluvian role and that was all right in the days of the Merchant of Venice and of Shylock but the Finance Minister of today is not merely a tax-gatherer but is also a wealth producer in the State and by applying reasonable laws and by demanding reasonable payment from the people by way of taxation, it is for the Hon. Minister for Finance to prove himself to be the Finance Minister of what we are now pleased to call a Welfare State and increase the wealth of the country. They say that before Christmas, they fatten the turkeys and I want the Hon. the Finance Minister to fatten the resources of the people of the State before the Budget dawns upon them.

"Regarding the new taxation proposals, I have no doubt they will be looked into very carefully; they include a surcharge on bus fares, the levy of betterment fee, a levy upon foreign liquor and a surcharge upon land revenue.

"I wish to state categorically that the whole policy in regard to land revenue administration requires a thorough re-orientation not on the lines on which some people are speaking, not even on the lines on which the Hon. the Leader of the Opposition is contemplating. It has been often said that we are short of food and we have been short of food and everywhere there is a talk that there is no food and just at that period what did the Government do? They abolished the zamindari system just by one stroke of the pen and it was broadcast everywhere that the zamindari system has been abolished and they wanted to claim that as a great victory even perhaps as a Field-Marshal will claim the annihilation of the armies of his enemy as a great victory and I asked this question repeatedly in this House: 'What did we do; were other things done to take the place of the man whom you had taken away?' I was a Member of the Select Committee appointed for this particular purpose and I know something of the possible consequences of the abolition of that system. I repeatedly asked: 'Can you show facts and figures to show that foodcrops, after the abolition of zamindaris have improved and will you dare deny my statement that the production of food has been seriously curtailed after the abolition of this system?' I am not questioning the wisdom or otherwise of the abolition of the zamindaris. But was it ever recognized that the zamindar had a part to play in the scheme of agriculture in the State; he had large pieces of land, no doubt, but he gave to the tiller of the soil those things necessary

[Dr. A. Lakshmanaswami Mudaliyar] [9th July 1952]

without which the tiller was not able to carry on his agricultural operations. He had bullocks and he fed them and kept them in good condition to be given to the ryot during the on-season and he had seeds and these he gave to the ryot during the on-season for sowing purposes. Now he has gone and what is it that the Government have done? Have they in any way taken the place of the zamindar? I say they have not and, if I am contradicted, nobody will be happier than I. I know that sooner or later most of these classes will have to go and I am not sorry for their exit and the only thing is where that liquidation level will stop. I only ask are we in a position to assure the public with facts and figures that consequent on the abolition of the zamindars or the janmis according to the Malabar Tenancy Act, the Government are supplying the things which the zamindar and the janmi were supplying to the ryots? Are you in a position to do that? If you do it and if the answer to my question is in the affirmative, my apologise for putting the question.

5-30
p.m.

"I have mentioned that the revenues of this State have more than doubled within the last six years, an unheard of thing in any State. Madras is the most heavily taxed State in the whole of India—I am credibly informed by responsible economists—and it can compare very favourably with any other State in the world. I realise that there are people now who are examining the finances of our State and who are going to report. I am not canvassing their support when I make this statement. I want people to realise that Madras at present is the most heavily taxed taking into consideration the poverty-stricken condition of the people. If I, therefore, plead that this State—unless a scientific examination is made—is not in a position to add to the taxes and contribute by way of additional taxation, you may ask me: 'What is it that you want us to do?' There are many things that I want you to do. Every time I go abroad and come back—unfortunately for me there have been rather frequent trips—I come with a feeling of utter depression at the condition of my country as compared with the condition of other countries. The very necessities of life are not there—no water-supply, no housing, no proper sanitation—certainly no environmental sanitation worth mentioning—no public health control, no control over such devastating diseases as malaria, cholera and many other water-borne diseases which, we know from our experience and knowledge, are responsible for the death of many human beings. In spite of all this, what is it that we are going to do? Merely criticising the Treasury Benches and pouring invectives on them and merely fighting the great battle of Mahabharatha—as if there are Kauravas on the one side and Pandavas on the other side—will not give the common man one more morsel of food than he is able to get today. I may assure the hon. Members on the Treasury Benches and the hon. Members behind me that my conception of the Government is, that it is not carried on by the Treasury Bench but by the legislators—those who are on and behind the Treasury Bench and those who are sitting opposite to them for one reason or another. It is we that contribute to the Government. It is only we that contribute to the success or failure of the Government. While

9th July 1952] [Dr. A. Lakshmanaswami Mudaliyar]

I have never hesitated to criticise the Government where I felt that criticism was necessary, I shall not be a party to such moves as walks-out and walks-in which might have been once spoken of with some amount of pleasure when some foreign Government was in charge of the Government. Sir, I believe that we have all to get down to the rock-bottom of our finances, by realizing that what is wanted, is better and more combined and more sustained effort on the part of everybody. We have to work harder, whatever position we occupy.

“ I will ask the Hon. the Chief Minister whether there is any country in the world where people enjoy the number of holidays that we do? Are you aware that, in the United Kingdom, the State gives only four holidays? Are you aware that even for Christmas Day, they do not have a holiday, whereas we give a holiday for every festival. For what purpose? I made this suggestion on a former occasion but it was a cry in the wilderness as it always has been the case during the last five years. Let us increase the amount of casual leave by five more days. Let us give an individual 20 days—if you like—if he is so very devoted to the religion that he professes to practise. I do not want to speak of God and religion here. But, Sir, come to my house and you will find that I am not so irreligious as people may believe. I do not feel the necessity of a holiday for religious purposes. Trained in the medical profession for 40 years, I have to work day-in and day-out and I know no Sunday or holiday. Do you like me to take a holiday when a woman is in labour and wants my services? That is why when you proposed in the Shop Assistants Act that people should work for four hours and then take rest for one hour and then work for another four hours, I asked the then Minister-in-charge, Dr. Rajan, whether that Act could be applied to the nursing profession and, if so, what would happen if a nurse working in the operation room says: ‘Here is the clock. From 8 I have been working and it is now 12. That is, I have worked for four hours. I am going away.’ There was no answer to that question. That brings me to the position that I wanted to say. During the last five or six years we have passed a number of measures which, not even in 25 years, have been passed in the previous Legislatures. The one accomplishment of the previous Ministry is the number of legislative enactments that they have passed. As to their merits or demerits and as to their legalities and illegalities, I must leave them to my hon. Friends belonging to the legal profession. Even some of us, unknown and unknowables so far as legal matters are concerned—were in a position to point out pitfalls which were not always accepted.

“ Sir, there is another point I should like to state in regard to legislative measures. I am particularly addressing the Hon. the Finance Minister. When you bring a legislative measure, do you ever consider its effect upon finance? I have cried in vain that every measure, that is brought in, should be vetted by the Finance Department as to its financial implications. You brought the Shop Assistants Act; it is costing the exchequer today Rs. 25 lakhs or more. You introduced and passed the Village Panchayats Act, perhaps in obedience to Article 40 of the Constitution. I am

[Dr. A. Lakshmanaswami Mudaliyar] [9th July 1952]

very glad that Act has been shelved—an Act full of meandering ways and full of pitfalls which, in actual working, will become patent by and by. The effect of putting that Act into force would mean an additional taxation of Rs. 4 crores. An army, a regular army—not even a battalion—of people have to be engaged to work that Act. So also in the case of the Zamindari Abolition Act, survey has not yet been completed but a crore of rupees had to be spent. From whom does it come? Does it come from the zamindars? Does it come even from the tenants who are supposed to have been benefited? It is you and I who have never had the fortune or the misfortune of being a zamindari tenant, that have to foot the Bill. My point in bringing this to your notice at present is, if you are getting any measure passed by this House, side by side with that measure, you should give us an estimate of the expenditure that will be involved in putting into operation such a measure. It is only then that we can have a correct evaluation of our financial position and what it means.

“ Sir, a great deal has been said about the handloom industry. But who is responsible for stifling this industry, the one great industry of this State? We were dictated to by the Centre and, I am afraid, we continue to be dictated to by the Centre. I am too loyal to my Constitution to fight that Constitution. But I am loyal to this State sufficiently to resist any undue, unnecessary, unwarranted interference from any other source. This morning, I saw in the papers that the purchase tax—or the sales tax—is to be Centralized. I ask, what is the justification? I do not see any difference between the Treasury Bench sitting in the Centre and the Treasury Bench sitting here. They are of the same mould. According to the hon. Leader of the Opposition, it may be a wrong mould. But I say, they are of the same mould. I do not see any reason whatever, why taxes which, according to the Constitution, have been definitely given to the States, should ever be tampered with. Sir, my feeble voice will always be raised whenever the limitation of the State Legislature in regard to these fields is ever attempted. It is for that reason that I somewhat impetuously resisted—my hon. Friend the Leader of the Opposition may probably know about it—and opposed in the last Council the Resolution of the Government seeking to empower the Central Government to levy estate duty on agricultural land. Sir, it is one of the very few taxation measures that have been left to the State. You (Sri Prakasam) were in the Constituent Assembly. I was far away in the wilderness and my voice was again a voice in the wilderness when that debate took place. The previous Ministry wanted to hand over the estate duty to the Central Government because they got a circular from the Finance Minister, Government of India, asking them to hand it over. Sir, I want to say this with all humility. The fact that you belong to the same political party in the Centre and in the State should not, by any means, permit you to forget the fact that the State is different from the Centre and that while the utmost co-operation should be given to the Centre, we should never surrender our judgment nor our independence where that independence has been granted to us by the Constitution itself.

9th July 1952] [Dr. A. Lakshmanaswami Mudaliyar]

“ Now, Sir, let me come to some of the proposals. I said that we should work harder. We cannot afford to increase establishments. My hon. Friend Mr. Bashyam, having thundered away yesterday, perhaps, feels somewhat indisposed and is not able to attend. I was listening with great interest when he said that the way in which you should promote rural welfare is by seeing to it that pensioners go back to rural localities. I happen to be a pensioner myself and I was trembling as to what would happen to me. I was waiting to hear from him if he would say that all lawyers who have ceased to practise or about to cease practice should go to the villages where, I am sure, they will also have some practice. They will be far more useful there than here. I know it is a very dangerous proposal. All these proposals arise out of a totalitarian mentality and not out of the democratic way of thinking. Sir, I ask again: ‘ What is the remedy for this? ’ A great deal has been said about Rural Welfare. My hon. Friend, the ex-Chief Minister referred to it. Now I come to a proposal which is a compliment to the hon. Leader of the Opposition and I hope he will listen to it. In 1946-47, he earmarked a sum of Rs. 4 crores for Rural Welfare and Harijan Uplift. You earmarked a sum of Rs. 1 crore for water-supply. I find from the Budget today that in this year of grace, 1952-53, there is still a balance of Rs. 1 crore and 75 lakhs and the present Government that you are criticising are going to spend for village uplift and Harijan Welfare. It is there because the Government never came forward with any suggestion; it is not we, the legislators, who are responsible. Talking about Rural Welfare, may I say this? A great deal is said about Rural Welfare but we are not talking the same language. A report was submitted by a Committee which is known as the Bhole Committee and in that report it was stated, the only proper method of improving the conditions of the villages, is to improve their amenities by way of good roads, water-supply, etc. It was suggested that a group of villages should be taken as a unit and in that unit a centre should be established. It is something much more than a primary health unit. You must have in the same unit co-operation, industries, medical relief, social welfare, public health and all those things that go to make the life of people full and happy whether they be in the cities or in the villages.

“ Sir, often and often, I have been asked the question, why don't the doctors go and settle in the villages and is there anything fundamentally wrong in their mentality? Sir, there is no profession in the world which has given you so much of honorary service as my profession has given. Today the Government are holding up their head and state that they have given so many hospitals and so many amenities. Could all these have been possible but for the honorary system of medical relief? So far as the villages are concerned, have you ever thought of constructing a little hut for a doctor to sit in and have his practice? Sir, you post doctors to villages if some District Board Presidents more influential than others and even more dogmatic than others—perhaps whose influence one cannot resist and it may be for a good cause—ask you to start a dispensary. The whole

[Dr. A. Lakshmanaswami Mudaliyar] [9th July 1952]

5-45
p.m.

system has not served well, judged from any rough and ready standard. I am not criticising this Government. When the Hon. Minister, Mr. Shetty, took charge of medical relief, he appointed two committees. Please do not think I am trying to boast my own performances. Fortunately I happened to be in every one of those committees and you, Sir, happened to be the Chairman of one of the committees. These committees were asked to report on medical education and to report on public health. The committees, after several sittings, submitted their report. The committees were composed of the Surgeon-General, the Director of Public Health, Mr. A. V. Raman, Dr. Tirumurthi, Dr. Sadagopan, Dr. Bhaskara Menon and Dr. Kini, with whose names the public of this State are quite familiar, and so there is no gain-saying the fact that the committees were composed of men of the best medical talents available. As I said, the committees submitted their report. But at the time when they submitted their report there was a change of portfolio, for some mysterious reason, which I am yet to know. Then all these reports were safely consigned to the archives of the Secretariat, and I have no doubt they will be left safely there for many many days to come unless something special happens to disturb them from that snug place! Then, another committee was appointed. I am sorry I have to refer to it, for somehow or other, I happen to have my finger in every pie. This was to report on the public health affairs in the State and to review the work done by District Health Officers, for it is necessary to know how to reorganize our hospitals, and to know whether the appellation 'District Health Officer' is right when the District Health Officer does very little of a district officer's work.

"Here let me congratulate the Hon. the Chief Minister, for he has done the wisest thing in appointing a non-medical man as the Minister of Public Health. When, in the time of Lord Goschen, the question of assigning a portfolio to Mr. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar, who had retired as Superintending Engineer, arose, Lord Goschen, himself a Parliamentarian and in addition to that, being the son of a great Parliamentarian, who was Finance Minister for some time, declared that those who are intimately in touch with a particular department should never be given that portfolio, and so, an engineer should not be put in charge of the Public Works Department. I am glad my Friend Dr. U. Krishna Rao, is in charge of some other portfolio. Because once they become Ministers of their departments, the heads of the Departments become head clerks, if not, steno-typists. That is why I objected in this House once to the appointment of Dr. T. S. S. Rajan as the Minister for Public Health; not because I am opposed to his appointment. I know Dr. Rajan was a capable Minister; he always acted with sagacity and pertinacity; but on principle I then said it is not correct to appoint him as Minister for Public Health.

"Now, Sir, I go with some trepidation of heart to the Hon. Minister for Education. No doubt he has had some interest in Education in the past. We have been hearing of late of the grievances of teachers, and rightly so, in no uncertain terms.

9th July 1952] [Dr. A. Lakshmanaswami Mudaliyar]

In this House, now, there are representatives of the teaching profession, and by their presence here, they have taken away some of my responsibility; for from my knowledge of their performance here, I feel they are in no way less vocal than anybody else. (Laughter.) But the fact remains today that though the teacher's profession is the noblest of professions, it remains the sorriest of trades. Wherever you may go in this State, you do not miss to hear of the resignation of a teacher or his withdrawal from his profession of primary school teacher. It may be in other provinces their position is worse today. But there is no gainsaying the fact that the primary school teacher today is in such a predicament that he can hardly show that energy, enthusiasm and intellectual vigour necessary to teach young children. What was their case thirty years back? I think my esteemed Friend over there will remember those days. From my own experience of the past fifty years, I should say, more than fifty years, for I am much older now, (laughter) than I really think, I know, in those days, the boys were asked to sit on the pial of the teacher's house; the teacher came and gave them sums to be worked; a Muhammadan gentleman he was; he had other avocations to attend to; so he came after some time with a cane in hand to see how the students had been faring in his absence. Now, I do not advocate those things today. Sir, the finance of this State is such that the State will never be able to meet their demands, even their just demands. So Government must think of giving them some further occupation. In what way should this be? I do not wish to say that now, though I have got my own suggestions regarding that. The primary school teacher probably may be asked to devote some hours in the morning to some other profession. We may remember what all things he attended to in the village in the olden days. Was he not the village priest, was he not the village statistician, was he not the village letter writer, was he not attending to similar one hundred and one things, in those days? So for God's sake, do something to see that his position is improved. Let us not harp on State finance, let us think of other methods. Now as a result of decontrol, a large staff has been thrown out of employment. I want all of us to realize, whether we are on the Treasury Bench or not, that unemployment, forced unemployment, or unemployment after some employment is the greatest friend of the type of people who are ready to utilize them for their own purpose. Therefore, Government should have a planned method of absorbing them. Train many of them as school teachers and give them employment, according to their qualifications. When the demobilised army came back to England, the soldiers were at a disadvantage. Most of them had no higher education or University education. So, the Government started hundreds of schools and absorbed them after giving the soldiers the necessary training. Sir, I had intended to speak on secondary education; but on second thought, in view of the recent announcement, I have chosen not to deal with it on this particular occasion.

“Sir, so far as University education is concerned, I think, even before I begin to speak I shall be credited as one too much interested in this education and therefore too importunate in my

[Dr. A. Lakshmanaswami Mudaliyar] [9th July 1952]

demands on Government. I am not going to make any demands on this occasion. I welcome any grant that is given to any of the Universities, that will help only the student. But I want to state this: all of us sit quiet till the day admission to colleges begins. Then come a number of telegrams after telegrams. I wish the charges of these telegrams are credited to the revenues of our State than allowed to go to the coffers of the Central Government. (Laughter.) Mahazars are sent, petitions are sent, and what is very interesting, the Bar Council becomes suddenly active (laughter) and resorts to Titanic activities and passes resolutions declaring that admissions should be increased, that students should not be deprived of collegiate education and so on. Now, who does not know it? Do you mean to say after having been for 27 years in touch with collegiate education and after having enjoyed for ten long years the privilege of being the Vice-Chancellor of the University, I do not know what the students need? We, in the University, know what the students want, though we may not be broadcasting it! During the five-year period from 1947, 26 new colleges have been opened, of which, one is a State college, still (the Hon. Sri Ranga Reddi will speak to it) in the embryonic stage, and one college is in Mercara. Besides these two colleges, 24 colleges under other auspices have been started. That I take it, is proof positive to show that we do not impose difficult conditions on the management before they open new colleges. We do not ask the management to provide palatial buildings or the most up-to-date scientific equipment and so on. We ask for ventilation, we ask for accommodation, we ask for students' amenities, we ask for hostels, where these poor struggling students may study in comfort so that they may not be exposed to the dangers which we, of the older generation, were faced with. Now, I ask, what is wrong in asking for these conditions? From the fact that we have opened 26 new colleges in the last five-year period, is it not proof positive, that the conditions are neither impossible nor difficult of fulfilment.

“ Sir, you will pardon me if I address the House a few minutes longer. There are a number of State Trading schemes. There are also a number of State enterprises. I have been carefully looking into the Budget of these schemes and enterprises and I have not been able to disentangle the mysteries connected with their profit and loss account. I ask, why cannot it be possible for the State to give us the returns of these ventures exactly as it is done in companies which they are bound to do under the Indian Companies Act. Why cannot we function like that? Why cannot the State Trading schemes and State enterprises function in the same way as private schemes are functioning? Let us know the facts about these enterprises; let us also know in what way they are defective, so that we may improve them. I think it is quite material to know them. At present, whatever be the kind of control exercised by the Government over them, now that our Hon. Chief Minister is here, I hope he will look into them. The schemes are already there, and my blessings are there. If they are not working on right lines, I suggest they should be made to do so.

9th July 1952] [Dr. A. Lakshmanaswami Mudaliyar]

“ Sir, a good deal was said about the Public Works Department. I would like to state that the Public Works Department of this State has done more meritorious service than the Public Works Departments in other States. The expression used by the Hon. Chief Minister (laughter) may not be wholly justified.”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ I said it in affectionate terms.” (Laughter.)

* DR. A. LAKSHMANASWAMI MUDALIYAR :—“ In that case I wish I could come into that category at some time also. (Laughter.) I want a committee to be appointed to go into the working of the Public Works Department. It is not as if there are no lacunae in that department. I referred to these in my speech last year and suggested that something should be done in this direction. When original estimates amount to Rs. 2 lakhs, in the revised estimates they become Rs. 5 lakhs; when original estimates for the construction of quarters to Police staff—which can hardly be called anything but hutments—for Rs. 70,000 and Rs. 80,000 rise under the revised estimate to three lakhs, I submit, there must be something rotten in the State of Denmark! I would draw the attention of the Hon. Mr. Ranga Reddi to this, for he was present in the Council when I made my speech last year, though in a different capacity. Now that he is the Minister for Public Works, I would request him to go into the question of the working of the Public Works Department, because there is something wrong there. It is necessary to know how things are being done, how far the system of departmental house construction is necessary and whether it is justifiable; and if so, what are the tests to be imposed; how far the system of contract exists; how far variations between original estimates and revised estimates could be improved; how far the person who is responsible for supervision of the work should be also responsible for check-measurement. I have been hoping that it will be possible for the Government to look into this, not in the sense that the P.W.D. is in the dock, for they have inherited traditions from an old system, and I hope the committee will be set up so that we may see where the system may be changed for the better.

“ Mr. Chairman, Sir, I am grateful to you for the indulgence you have shown me by allowing me sufficient time to deal with all these points. I have said, I come here from a tour, from a Western tour, not from a holiday tour, but from a tour of some responsibility. Let me tell you this: the world is moving fast apace. When we discuss small affairs of our State here, we hardly know what is taking place elsewhere. Let us realize the world forces that are arrayed against us. Let us realize that larger issues are at stake. The sands of time are falling fast; the water is leaking fast into the vessel. This is not the time for us to be set against one another; this is not the time to forget the revised version of the words of Lord Macaulay, one may say ‘ Now Indian is to an Indian more hateful than a foe.’ I appeal to the Members, to the 6 p.m. Members on the Treasury Benches and to the Members opposite here, to realize that their duty is by the common people and not in

[Dr. A. Lakshmanaswami Mudaliyar] [9th July 1952]

getting into a wrestling match with each other on all occasions. Mistakes there may be. Let us criticise the Government. People have spoken about a stable Government. A stable Government in a democracy is a contradiction in terms. We speak of good Government and I hope that good Government will be also a stable Government. It is in that hope and with that expectation that I wish this present Government with the Hon. Members on the Treasury Benches to be a stable Government. So far as I am concerned, it will be my endeavour to express my innermost feelings at all times, to criticise the Government when necessary and to give that just meed of praise, not in the handsome manner in which my hon. Friend, Mrs. Clubwala, will exchange bouquets, but in a gentle manner. Thus only and then only would we be able to discharge our duties as legislators."

* SRI B. V. SUBRAHMANYAM :—“ Mr. Chairman, Sir, I am new to the Legislative Council, and newer still to a Budget debate, but I have been learning things. One thing peculiar to this debate which I have learnt is that I should follow the norm of congratulating the Chief Minister and his colleagues on the policy of decontrol which they have initiated even before this House and the other House met this time. I do not make a point of it that this policy was taken up before this House met or before the two Houses met and without the permission of the Houses of the Legislature. I do not think that I should make a serious complaint, or that the party to which I belong should make a serious complaint, about the fact that this very wise policy, in my view, however courageous it is, has been taken up in the manner in which, or at the time at which, it was taken up. But I must add this. Courage always implies some risk. With five lakhs of tons of foodgrains in one's hand, this is a risk that could very easily be taken. The risk is the same as always was there ever since scarcity started during war time, namely, that blackmarketers, who in my part of the country at least are mostly mill-owners, will again fake into their own hands the grains which must, in a contingency, be taken by the State, for its own replenishment of the five lakhs of tons that must in a critical stage go to certain critical areas. I would have been happier if this policy of decontrol was combined with some other policy on behalf of the State to gather itself or to have agencies to gather for it the grains as they come from time to time in a manner to meet contingencies that are very likely to arise in a State like ours which is famine-ridden very frequently. What I have in mind is this. In 1947 or 1948 or thereabouts the Ministry of Mr. Prakasam started a scheme of producer-cum-consumer societies. Mr. Prakasam, whatever else he is and whatever else he is not, is a great believer in two things. I am not here to praise him and bury others, but I must say this for him, and I say it with the utmost humility. He has great faith in certain institutions and certain functions which are at the very rock-bottom and are at the very basis of our life in this State. He believes, for instance, in the co-operative movement which has a future in our State if only the leaders of our State know how to make use of it. He has great faith in the village republics. The Constitution no doubt says the

9th July 1952] [Sri B. V. Subrahmanyam]

same things, and puts the same faith in certain Articles of the Constitution but the emphasis is wanting, I fear, in our administration so far as these go. I find that in my part of the country—I come from the East Godavari district—the enthusiasm that was roused for the producer-cum-consumer societies was suddenly chilled, not merely chilled but murdered! And that, by the succeeding Government which possibly saw in these schemes a desire or an intent on the part of Mr. Prakasam to strengthen his own political hold on certain peoples. Now, Sir, there is the danger always in the co-operative movement that it may not go into the right hands, but this does not mean that the co-operatives should not flourish or that the Government should not give its complete support to the growth of the co-operative movement. I find, Sir, that this scheme of producer-cum-consumer societies had not been allowed to grow as it was growing at one time, and I also find from the speech of my hon. Friend, Sri M. P. Govinda Menon, that in his part of the country, in Malabar the producer-cum-consumer societies have thriven in such a manner that even to-day, they can be a source of help and energy to the State. Because of the murder of these institutions by the Ministry that preceded the present one—and I am very glad that this Ministry has nothing to do with that Ministry—I find, Sir, that blackmarketers and anti-social elements all around the villages have grown in strength in such a manner that they are a menace to-day at the stage of decontrol. I suggest, Sir, to the Hon. the Finance Minister, who was responsible for decontrol largely, in the shape in which it has come, and I suggest, Sir, to the Hon. the Chief Minister, whose brain and intellect were behind every one of these schemes, that, instead of leaving it to the ordinary merchant to collect the grain and to save the situation on critical occasions, this Government and this administration should take on hand the growth and the flourishing of these producer-cum-consumer societies, or whatever their present name might be, not merely for the purpose of collecting the grain and keeping it on hand for any contingencies, and not merely for the purpose of having an agency in one's hand which will work for the collection of these grains as against the anti-social elements, but for a larger purpose which I would leave for certain other friends of mine who are more in the co-operative movement than I am to expatiate upon. I am a Director of the Co-operative Central Land Mortgage Bank, and I know something about how these co-operatives function, but I leave this aspect to some other Friends like Sri N. Satyanarayana who are very very able men, who have worked in the co-operative movement for a large number of years, and who, Sir, know the ins and outs of this movement, and who can give suggestions, and help us in the matter of the growth of the co-operative movement. I say this, Sir, because the growth of the co-operative movement is the only answer we have for the problem posed to us, that we are functioning in this country, as several other countries near and around us are also functioning, as a mere capitalist State. It is easy to complain that everything that is happening, even an impetus to the co-operative movement, is happening, as a capitalist State's endeavour, but a capitalist State is sometimes merely a name that is given in order to find

[Sri B. V. Subrahmanyam]

[9th July 1952]

fault with the particular administration that is at hand. A State need not be capitalist always and in all things, and no party is merely capitalist always and in all things. It is true that this party which is now in power and this State now governed by it can be called a capitalist State because it cannot think of any other way of managing things except by keeping the *status quo* as it is.

“Sir, when I look at the Budget, the first thing that I find is that it does not deal with any change in the social order or contemplate anything that would bring about certain relevant and necessary changes which we are waiting for. One of the changes for which we are waiting, as I have already said, is the growth of the co-operative movement. What, I ask, has this Budget to say about this? I find that with respect to the item of expenditure, ‘Co-operation’ so small a sum as 70 lakhs is provided for. Whereas, what is it, Sir, that we spend on the Police? It is considerably more, ten times and more. It is true that it can always be pleaded that there is ‘chaos’ in the State, and the Police are needed to face it, but the chaos is something that we must understand as a thing within the social order or outside it and not as the same thing whether it is inside or outside. I will make myself a little clearer. There is such a thing as administrative chaos, a chaos which is brought about as a result of certain inner difficulties which have not been met and the State is unable to meet them and therefore this chaos springs to the surface.”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“Inherent chaos.”

* SRI B. V. SUBRAHMANYAM :—“I will take the word ‘inherent chaos’ to describe that sort of thing. There is the other type of chaos which comes merely as a measure of one party or one individual trying to wrest power from another party or another individual. I can understand, Sir, several crores being spent by the Manchurian or the big Chinese Ward Lords in their fight against other War Lords but when the expenditure on the Police multiplies itself from time to time and from Budget to Budget in a democratic State, I say, there is something wrong with the conditions in that State. It is true, Sir, that a friend of ours on the other side of the table was yesterday exhorting the Chief Minister not to reduce the Police cadre even by one policeman. (Interruption.) Sri Rajeswara Rao says the hon. Member even wanted an increase in the Police force. The necessity, as such, for increasing the Police force is itself not merely an indication of what is external chaos, the chaos that was once visible between War Lords in China, but is also a symptom and a sign of inherent chaos. Why is it that people have become disorderly? Why is it that people give trouble like this? Why is it that people are not standing up to law and order in the manner in which we expect them to stand up?”

AN HON. MEMBER :—“Lessons from Russia.”

* SRI B. V. SUBRAHMANYAM :—“Lessons from Russia are the same as lessons from any other country which administers itself in the manner it best likes. It is the same everywhere.

9th July 1952] [Sri B. V. Subrahmanyam]

“ Now, Sir, as far as this country is concerned, the chaos that the administration is thinking of is really inherent chaos. But when it calls it chaos and when it fights it, it fights it not as inherent chaos but as surface chaos, as if the chaos was a war between two war lords.”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ The difference between allopathic and other treatments.”

* SRI B. V. SUBRAHMANYAM :—“ Sir, I do not know the difference between allopathy and other treatments but I know that, unless we go into these internal problems, we will not be able to find an answer for the problems on the surface. Now, Sir, looking at this Budget, as I already said from the angle of social order and social justice, I find that it has no angle of vision at all, and continues the old tradition of treating every man as one man and treating every problem as just that problem, instead of treating the problem as one in a series of problems, and treating the social order itself as much more important than any single aspect of it.

“ For an instance, I shall come to the subject of Prohibition. It is true that drinking is an evil. (An hon. Member: ‘ Individually?’) Yes. Drink is an evil if a man overdrinks. It is also however, very probable that, if a man is left to drink, he will go on drinking, but that may only be an assumption again. Let us take it that drink for an individual is an evil. Let us quite suppose that drink is an evil. But the habit is something that comes not merely because there are drinks to drink, but because a man has not got enough to do, has not got enough to satisfy his mind and soul in this life, and the drink habit comes only as a symbol of that dissatisfaction. The thing to tackle is this dissatisfaction, and not the habit of drinking. It seems to me that in our social order the people who drink more are the people who are the most impoverished in this State, and the poor people who have so little to think of doing in their life. The life of the poor people in this State is something which requires investigation. Why is it that to-day, in spite of so many years of Prohibition, there are still so many crimes, and so much of the Police Budget has to be intended to fight Prohibition offences? I may even venture to say, that, as one of the ‘ good ’ results that flow from out of decontrol, the Chief Minister is probably thinking of transferring this Police force for controls straight into the Prohibition chamber in order to fight Prohibition offences and see that, according to his view, the offences come down. But, will they? That is the question. Prohibition in my view and in the view of the party to which I belong, has been a failure, not so much because drinking is good or drinking is evil—that is irrelevant—but because it is impossible to tackle the problem of drink unless you tackle the much larger problem of the men themselves; the problem of their not having enough to do, the problem of their not having enough to eat and the problem of their not belonging to a social order of which one can say that it is a reflection of a sense of social justice. Now, as far as the problem of Prohibition in this State is concerned, unless it is possible for us to say that hereafter people will not drink because we have got so

[Sri B. V. Subrahmanyam] [9th July 1952]

much of the Police and so much of the Act to wield against them, unless you can say that, with the fear of the Police and the Magistracy, drink is going down as a habit of the people, it is no use trying to argue that the forces of the State to fight drink should be enlarged or increased in strength, and that we should wait to see what the result of that would be. If the Hon. Ministers belong to rural areas, and have ever travelled in rural areas, and been there for some time—I claim that I have been spending, year after year, two months in a particular rural area, living in a hut of my own—they will find, as I have found, that, as far as certain elements of the rural population are concerned, and these are always the worst drunkards, these people still continue as drunkards. I hope there is some difference between my district and the other districts, because in my district, the state of affairs is very very bad. I have often asked myself, why is it so? And the answer, according to me, is that Prohibition can never succeed as a measure which is merely punitive, and propaganda will not avail where men have not in the social order found their place in the scheme of things. Now, why is it that we should try to tackle the problem of Prohibition only from the punitive side? Why is it that we think that man is drinking less? It is because it suits us to think so and because we have not lived in the rural areas or followed the lives of the people who are accustomed to drink. These people, in the districts I know, are mostly members of the two communities, Mala and Madiga. I do not know if even one per cent of the persons who are present in this House and even five per cent of the persons who are present in the Legislative Assembly have intimate contact with the lives of these two communities or their counterparts in the other districts. They have continued to live as they have always been living, and, if the things they want are things like drink, they have been going for them in the manner in which their own impulses lead them. The Prohibition Police, I am sorry to say,—I do not mean that every Prohibition Policeman is a scoundrel, far from it,—have been acting in a manner that is not conducive either to their own good or to the good of the community. The Prohibition Police are not always restricted to that one department. I find that these Police are again drafted to other departments. These police are so corrupt that they become engines of corruption in other departments. It is true that we have been praising the policy of decontrol because it brings or might bring honesty to certain departments and certain officers. If these corrupt officers go to other departments, whether the other departments might also get corrupted, in the same manner as the Prohibition police are corrupt, we cannot foresee at the moment. Some Prohibition staff are not willing to bring into the open all the offences that have come to their knowledge. If they do, they will be very good civil servants, but they will not be serving themselves in the manner in which they seem to wish to serve themselves. Therefore, I suggest, that this scheme of Prohibition should be scrapped; and the policy of dealing with the people who are addicted to drink should be not to remove the drink from the man but to remove the man from the drink, in a manner that is consistent with all policies of honesty and fair-play to human beings.

9th July 1952] [Sri B. V. Subrahmanyam]

That is why I say that, as long as Prohibition is left to play a lone role for itself in the manner in which it has been playing havoc with the economies of our State, our State will continue to be, by a vicious circle of spending and losing, a State which is always deficit.

“Forty crores of rupees of reserves have disappeared. We are promised that the balance of fourteen and a half crores of rupees will not be there by the end of the year. And what in return have we got? What are the large schemes that this State has undertaken for the benefit of the people in a manner to counter-measure the forty crores disappearance? I find, Sir, that it is consistent with the policy of Prohibition of this Ministry that the production of wealth in this State is equally ignored by this Ministry. Why is it that this Budget or any other Budget prepared by this party when it was in power in the earlier years has not provided for the production of wealth in the manner in which the productive forces of this State require to be marshalled, and in the manner in which the productive wealth of the country and the wealth of this State in particular, should be increased manifold? To-day, for instance,—again I am referring to my part of the State, the Andhra area—we find that two schemes, two river valley projects, have been shelved. Why? Because both the rivers have become political rivers! The Krishna-Pennar and Godavari Projects have become projects that are associated with certain parties and certain peoples, and each is fighting for his project, and each is placing his project over the other, without considering either the engineering side of each or the financial side of each and without any other basis except a political basis and a political bias. What do we find? We find that certain moneys fifty-eight thousand and odd of what were reserved for the Ramapadasagar project, have been taken back. We find that the Krishna-Pennar project is considered to be no better for the economy of the State than to deserve a provision of one lakh of rupees in the Budget estimates. Now, Sir, it is common knowledge, at least for the ordinary people who understand things with their commonsense, that the Krishna River, if there is to be a project like the Krishna Pennar project, cannot convey waters down South, to the extent to which it was intended to convey waters, unless the waters of the Krishna are replenished by the waters of the Godavari. To replenish the waters of the Krishna in a manner to bring the waters of the Krishna down South, it is necessary to harness the waters of the Godavari by a dam on the Godavari. The two schemes are not rivals of each other. Everybody should know that when I say the Krishna-Pennar, I mean the project which tries to bring the waters of the Krishna down to Nellore district and to the Ceded districts in whatever way it is intended to do so. I would even go further and say that I, as an Andhra, would have no objection if there is plenty of water in the Krishna and the Godavari, to allow that water to flow down further South in the way that our friends of the South require it to flow rather than find it useless for ourselves and allow it to run into the sea provided the men of those valleys and those deltas have their rights of first and second crops ensured. It is no

[Sri B. V. Subrahmanyam] [9th July 1952]

use trying to say that the waters of the Krishna should be allowed to drain and lose themselves, through seepage and evaporation, into the Southern districts, and that either the Krishna delta or the Godavari delta or the regions of the Krishna and Godavari which have a preferential right, as I have already said, for first and second crops, should be deprived of that water. I put this question to the Hon. Minister for Irrigation, 'What *has* been done to implement these river valley projects in Andhra?'

"The production of wealth is the first duty of a State. Without the production of wealth, if you start taxing you will have to think of schemes, as my hon. Friend, Dr. Lakshmanaswami Mudaliar stated, that will tax the same man over and over again from different directions, and the whole process of taxation will become a mere vexation and will not serve its own purpose. That is why, I say there should have been a fundamental change in the Budget outlook of the present Ministry which I think is not a continuation of the old Ministry. There should have been some provision in the Budget for much larger schemes than the schemes they are contemplating for the production of wealth in this State. It is true that it is the Central or Union Government that is largely responsible, under the Five Year Plan and things like that, to produce the wealth of the State in the manner in which we contemplate such production. But this State is not powerless, and ought not to be powerless, and ought not allow itself to remain powerless, in the matter of bargaining and getting from the Centre all that is required for the production of wealth in this State. That is why, Sir, I also say that this provision about Sales Tax is merely trying to get wealth for the exchequer from the already taxed people. Sales Tax should not be merely encouraged to grow from point to point as if the sole object of the Government was to find enough money to run its administration. What is this administration doing? It is merely running itself. Sometimes when I contemplate the actions of the Government here, and think of the 'Law and Order' that this Government wish to maintain as the prime object of their continuance, the analogy strikes me of some dainty old maiden aunt, with a passion for neatness trying to dust the furniture even when the furniture is on fire. Law and Order are not everything. Law and Order must mean that they will preserve something that they ought to preserve. What is it that we have done to the social order which requires such preservation? How could there not be some elements fighting for their own rights in the manner in which they should fight, and proclaiming that this Government is not based on social justice, and that it must change, that its whole outlook must change, and that it must change its whole policy in order to conform to its duties and to its responsibility towards the representatives of the people and towards the people? Now, as far as this Administration is concerned, the only thing that it has done is decontrol. Decontrol, one must know, is but putting the State back in the stage in which it was in 1945. Now, 1945 is not such a glorious year, and does not represent such a glorious era that we should want its coming back, as if

9th July 1952] [Sri B. V. Subrahmanyam]

1945 was Ramrajya. Decontrol by itself does not mean anything, unless it is followed up by certain policies which mean the betterment of the people.

“Coming to the other features of the Budget, I find that, as far as irrigation and education are concerned nothing is done that is spectacular. Not merely spectacular but, also, nothing is done that is really a change from the routine of the years. It is true that the non-gazetted officers have been benefited to a small extent by the educational concessions given to them. What is it that has been done to make primary education compulsory throughout the State? Already five years have passed since Independence came into being. Is there any step taken by way of an amendment of the Panchayat Act or any contemplated measure with respect to education to see that every child in the State gets educated at least up to the minimum standard? What is it that you are doing except trying to find seats in educational institutions for people some of whom do not deserve seats? What is it that you are doing except sending out people abroad and finding them coming back without the use or the necessity for such people in our midst because we have no industries? Industrialisation—production of wealth—all these would require a bold and venturesome policy, that will not think merely in terms of money and of balancing the Budget and spending on mere administration. My Friend, Mr. Balasubramanya Ayyar, was saying that because we could not balance the Budget—if I understand him aright—we ought not to have any big projects at all or any of these big schemes. Now that is a very wrong way to look at things.”

SRI K. BALASUBRAMANYA AYYAR :—“I did not state anything of the kind.”

* SRI B. V. SUBRAHMANYAM :—“I am sorry if I have misquoted him, and if he has not stated what I have said he stated. I am very glad, he has not said what I thought he said. As far as these schemes are concerned, we should give them top priority, irrespective of the balancing of the Budget, which is not the main thing. Unless we give top priority to these schemes, our Budget is a failure, and it merely means the continuance of the *status quo*. And, therefore, I plead that as long as this *status quo* is what is sought to be preserved by the law and order that this Government and this Administration prize as the highest object in the land, they will be doing neither their duty to themselves nor their duty to the citizens of the State.”

MR. CHAIRMAN :—“I now adjourn the House to meet again at 4 p.m. on Thursday, the 10th July 1952.”

The House then adjourned.